

**Karner Blue HCP  
Implementation Oversight Committee (IOC) Meeting  
November 9, 2005  
9:00 a.m. -2:30 p.m.  
DNR Service Center, 473 Griffith Avenue, Wisconsin Rapids**

**MINUTES**

**Attending:** Steve Richter, Joel Aanensen, Crystal Fankhauser, Bob Hess, Cyndi Blalack, Matt Krumenauer, Jim Zahasky, Dave Lentz, Gary Birch, Joe Henry (recorder)

**1. Anti-Trust Statement**

**Cyndi read the anti-trust statement and it was noted that copies of the entire statement are available upon request.**

**2. Approve minutes from 8-10-05**

**Gary motioned to approve the minutes and seconded by Joel Aanensen. Minutes were approved as they stand. All were in favor; none against.**

**3. Review action items from last meeting**

- **Update on IOC representatives and/or alternates**
  - **Forest Industry (alternate)**  
**Joel A. is still acting as a substitute for the forestry industry. He will continue to get a volunteer to be the official alternate.**
  - **County Forest (alternate)**  
**Jim Z. is standing in for Jody but Wood County is still looking for a replacement. Jake Nichols is a likely candidate but nothing is definite yet.**
  - **DATCP (Lori's replacement?)**  
**Dave commented that DATCP is still exploring an alternate for Lori and that they will notify us when the decision is resolved.**
- **Re: 50-year permit extension action: Dave to summarize the IOC discussion and decision in a heads-up memo to partners.**  
**Dave did not do this. He feels that DNR should provide their approach and cost analysis in order to make the summary memo constructive vs. concerning.**

**4. Inclusion updates**

- **Oakdale Electric CI Request**
  - **Cathy has CI request but sent it back to be revised, Dave needs to respond to Cathy's comments. This will likely result in changes to their SHCA. Since it**

is already signed, Dave commented that in the future all new SHCAs should be thoroughly reviewed by the Service before signing.

- **Plum Creek CI Request**

- Dave developed a comparative analysis of Plum Creeks SHCA vs. the old Nekoosa documents and submitted to Cathy with the request. This process should be straight forward but he hasn't heard from Cathy yet.

- **Adams Columbia Electric Cooperative SHCA**

- They dropped the ball on the process due to some confusion among staff. Dave met with ADEC and Stan Higby is taking the lead and has the permit template. Dave hopes to share the status of this process at the next IOC meeting.

**5. HCP 6-mo review meeting briefing.**

- Dave gave a summary of the meeting. Overall the meeting was good; there were no resolutions to the renewal process. Some important points made were that the Service feels that they pushed the envelop in the beginning especially with the volunteer process. The partners hope is to streamline the whole process due to cost in time and money in light of a permit extension. In reality, some partners won't sign on for a long-term extension if things aren't changed, primarily due to costs that they are incurring. In essence, the partners and DNR are putting forth a lot of time and cost. Janet eluded that her potential replacement is probably going to be reluctant to make any radical changes from what is normal and already in place.

Dave commented on Shifting Mosaic (SM). Most partners aren't able to demonstrate SM and that there needs to be a simpler way/system (GIS or map based system) before partners can consistently do this. NNLOH was discussed; specifically that it is incredibly difficult to demonstrate this on the scale of the HCP in WI. Janet agreed that it is difficult and that there are some alternatives that can be explored i.e., other measurable indicators. One possible indicator may be to document how much transition of long/short-term habitat is happening on the landscape. Documenting habitat transition is a proactive way of identifying managed lands that are now suitable for KBBs rather than identifying total acres of suitable habitat which is lost.

**6. Long-term permit extension perspective: Work on proposal for HCP systems and processes appropriate for a 30-50 year period.**

Some partners are uncomfortable with the extension process so we need to identify what they are and if we can find solutions. It was decided that we would brainstorm a series of points that we could develop into an alternative plan.

**A. Some of the issues and concerns are;**

- The KBB isn't really endangered in WI, why can't we use our resources for a more deserving species.

- Maybe we should focus on recovery properties rather than all of the small, isolated sites.
- We should work on habitat and not species.
- What are we monitoring for?
- What do we know now that we didn't know when the HCP was written?
- We have deviated from the "economically sound" solution in the Articles of Partnership goals.
- Are the goals relevant today?
- Ask if Recovery goals are met?
- Opportunities are being lost!
- Monitoring is driven off of NNLOH, should be measuring>NNL of biological/disturbance management.
- Cost of pre-management surveys so they don't mow beyond 15' (Gary B.). The question was raised that maybe some/many of the partners may want to drop out of the HCP because they feel the species is recovered and because it is too costly to manage for consideration of Kbb's. The downside of not continuing beneficial disturbance management is that eventually the KBBs will disappear because of succession of habitat, and could become rarer in areas outside of recovery properties.

**B. What systems/activities do you see needing to change in order to resolve key concerns and provide incentives to partners to stay in the HCP?**

- Take: can we just apply this (regulatory compliance actions) to permanent take, and simply continue to do beneficial conservation measures?
- Measuring and reporting incidental (short-term) take doesn't seem to have any benefits or use as data.
- Change in definition of take may affect monitoring and reporting.
- What is the value of monitoring? Are we monitoring the right things in the right places? Should long-term monitoring be on recovery properties?
- Inclusion process is cumbersome and a time/cost drain.
- Mitigation shouldn't have to be so costly and intense; mitigation objectives should be commensurate with the fact the Kbb is not that rare in WI.
- Lands database is a cumbersome and dynamic process; need to make it much less labor intensive and more accurate and easier to use.
- Training and Orientation: In looking at a long-term permit (up to 50 yrs.), we can expect a lot of staff turnover. It will be crucial to have a much more effective and efficient system to train new people.
- Reporting for Monitoring (accuracy, consistency, workload)
- Goals of HCP should be revisited. The HCP was written with 10 years in mind; 50 years is a whole different story.
- Changed circumstances have resulted in positive habitat creation. If the premise for reporting changed circumstances is to identify and remediate negative incidents, then it seems fruitless to go through this exercise.

- Define a more strategic place to focus efforts.
- What is a site?
- How do we prove SM or not?
- Annual Reports could be made easier and simpler. What is important to report?
- Outreach and Education: why is it a requirement? Do we really need to educate people or lawmakers or not at all. Why is it important to encourage more Kbb?
- Audits are a costly exercise for the DNR. How can these costs be reduced?
- Trust and flexibility – accept mgmt experience and allow more flexibility based on management experience, i.e. Rx burn protocol.
- Streamlined amendment approval processes
- Operating agreement and the SHCA (approval process chart); defining the steps is a good start, but the steps are too complicated and costly.
- Long-term habitat plans for county forest partners should be revisited. Fifty years is lot different than 10.

**C. General descriptions of alternatives:**

- Status quo (costly)
- HCP w/improved value added systems and reduced costs
- Complete restructuring given what we have learned and that the timeframe is much different (50 years vs. 10 years)

**D. There are several routes that might characterize partners various situations regarding the alternatives above:**

- Avoid take and drop out
- Let habitat succeed and then drop out
- Walk away from this HCP and get own individual HCP
- No land, no habitat, no Kbb, and no other reason to stay, so walk away
- Stay in HCP.

**What can be changed/or what can we discontinue and still make this work?**

**Improve successional management by changing the format of winter meetings such that the first day is set up for tutorials. For example, a forestry mentor (for forestry folks) to walk individuals through their day to day operations, offer a barrens workshop for people that want to learn more about barrens diversity and biological significance.**

**Dave suggested that one potential solution would be to focus efforts only on recovery areas and that only those partners that own land in/near these areas would be required to apply the HCP when working on their lands in the SPA/ACEs. All others would shift into the voluntary category.**

Steve asked if we would be working under some kind of timeline to identify what our alternative proposal would be. Dave referred to the agenda and that we would fill in a calendar to help with this process.

**TALKING POINTS for IOC members to take to the other partners in their entity group regarding a possible 50 year extension:**

- 1) **Status Quo not acceptable, introduce problem statement**
  - FWS suggested 50 yrs
  - R-not on horizon
  - Unless Act changes we will need to do something for ITP
- 2) **Alternatives**
  - Status quo is costly
  - Can leave
  - We can redesign HCP to reduce costs/workload
- 3) **Possible Solutions**
  - In/Out: partners will each have to do their own cost analysis
  - Shorter time extension to work on a renewal proposal

**Action Item: Crystal will talk with Louise Simon and Calvin Lawrence about the wetland mapping program in WI to see if it may be of some use to us in developing a similar program for Kbb's.**

**7. Set dates for 2006 HCP Calendar and Winter Meeting Agenda**

- **Schedule IOC meetings**
  - December 7 working group meeting
  - December 14 working group meeting
  - January 17 IOC Meeting (ATC) in Madison
  - March-May MIT & entity groups to work on process improvements
  - April 6-month review meeting: make initial renewal proposal
  - June Field Trip/redesigning meeting
  - October 2006: 6-month meeting – final draft proposal
- **Schedule Winter HCP Team meeting date and location**
  - March 8 HCP Team Meeting in Point or Rapids TBD

**Action Item: IOC to frame up winter meeting agenda in December working group meetings**

**8. Receipt and management of HCP fees and other funds.**

- **Dave is working with the Natural Resources Foundation on an escrow account agreement.**
- **International Paper (Gary Donovan) has offered to support HCP needs, i.e. O&E products with a cash donation; need to finalize NRF agreement to be able to accept money before the end of the calendar year.**

<b>NOTE: We did not have time for agenda items 9-11.</b>
--

- 9. Lupine modeling project: Ted Sickley would like partner input on desired applications and other suggestions.**
- 10. Electronic monitoring submissions? Jody asked for a form fill version of L1-3 forms. Crystal surveyed partner & DNR staff to assess interest of others.**
- 11. Need to update Partners & Participants List; HCP involvement roles and contact information; and changing types of roles**

\IOC Minutes 11-9-05 draft 2.doc